DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 537 CS 217 659

AUTHOR	Redd, Teresa M.
TITLE	"How I Got Ovah": Success Stories of African American Composition Students, Part II.
PUB DATE	2001-03-00
NOTE	24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (52nd, Denver, CO, March 14-17, 2001). Part I, the author's report on the pilot study is not available from ERIC.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Students; Freshman Composition; Higher Education; *Language Attitudes; Portfolio Assessment; *Standard Spoken Usage; *Student Attitudes; Teacher Response; Teacher Role; Writing Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*African Americans

ABSTRACT

This study explored how some African American students dramatically improved their control of Edited American English (EAE) in their introductory composition course at Howard University. The participants included 40 students who were enrolled in ENGL 002 in 1998, 1999, or 2000, as well as the 10 teachers who had recommended the students as "most improved." A pretest-posttest comparison and portfolio assessment isolated two distinct groups of students within this sample: 18 "successful" students who had achieved consistent progress and 22 "struggling" students whose performance had proved inconsistent. To determine why the Successful Group had progressed more than the Struggling Group, the research team addressed the following questions: How did the teachers strengthen the students' command of EAE? What successful strategies did the students employ on their own? What roles did other people and resources play in the students' progress? What role did the students' and teachers' language attitudes play? With these questions in mind, the team conducted discourse-based interviews with the students and their teachers, classified errors in the portfolios, and coded the interview data. The data analysis revealed that both groups of students attributed most of their progress to their teachers' written comments rather than readings, lessons, writing assignments, conferences, peer review, or independent work. However, there were significant differences in (1) the groups' awareness of their writing problems; (2) their evaluation of their independent study; (3) their sources of motivation; (4) their choice of partners for collaboration; and (5) their attitudes toward Standard English. Surprisingly, language attitudes played the most statistically significant role in the study. Nearly all of the members of the Successful Group portrayed Standard English, especially EAE, as a "universal" language that allows Americans to understand one another. On the other hand, the Struggling Group was more likely to regard Standard English merely as a school or job requirement rather than a "lingua franca" to facilitate communication. Notably, the only students who considered Standard English "White" belonged to the Struggling Group. The study contains 20 references. Appendixes contain the research questions, 7 tables of data, and brief descriptions of 7 additional significant findings. (RS)

ED 455 537

"How I Got Ovah": Success Stories of African American Composition Students, Part II.

by Teresa M. Redd

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. M. Redd
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS 217 659

"How I Got Ovah":
Success Stories of African American Composition Students, Part II
College Composition & Communication Conference
Denver, Colorado
March 15, 2001

"How I got ovah.
How I got ovah.
Oh, my soul looks back and wonders
how I got ovah."

For the last two years, I have been asking freshman composition students at Howard University to look back and explain how they "got ovah." When they began taking freshman composition, Edited American English (or so-called Standard Written English) loomed before them, ready to trip them at every turn. But by the end of the semester, like the singer of the spiritual, they *were* success stories. So today I've come to share with you the secrets of their success.

But, first, let me tell you about our students. At Howard University almost all of our freshmen are African American, and at times most of them speak African American Vernacular English (that is, AAVE). Like Smitherman (1977, 1994a, 1994b), Labov (1977), Wolfram (1991), Rickford (2000), Baugh (1999) and others, I have taught students that African American Vernacular English is a culturally rich and rule-governed dialect, that the lexicon of AAVE has revitalized the vocabulary of mainstream America, and that the rhythm and imagery of AAVE can enhance writing, including academic prose. I have also pointed out that Edited American English (that is, EAE) is not linguistically superior to other dialects, that it is not the *sine qua non* of effective writing, and that it cannot guarantee social, political, or economic mobility. Nevertheless, surveys suggest

that EAE is a prerequisite for students who wish to communicate effectively in the professional world (Hairston 1981; Redd 1998). Even if they oppose that world, Delpit (1995) argues, EAE gives students "one more voice for resisting and reshaping an oppressive system" (166). Therefore, virtually all of my students have chosen to write Edited American English, and they expect me to equip them for that task.

However, two years ago, after 16 years of teaching EAE with limited success, I looked back and wondered whether I had been going about it the right way. Perhaps I had overlooked something. After all, as Smitherman (1977), Ball (1992), and others have revealed, many African American students bring to the study of EAE different sociolinguistic patterns and cultural preferences, and these differences may call for different strategies—that is, "different strokes for different folks." Recognizing this possibility, researchers have implemented a variety of methods to motivate and empower African American students to learn EAE. Yet few researchers have reported statistically significant progress. Two noteworthy exceptions are Ball (1994) and Taylor (1989). Ball's study documents how a "worksheet-based, explicit instructional program" improved AAVE-speakers' mastery of some EAE uses of the /s/ suffix while a "culturally sensitive literature-based approach" improved their mastery of others (pp. 23, 43). Taylor achieved success as well by combining second-language teaching methods with the discussion, imitation, and translation of multicultural literature.

Taylor's and Ball's results underscore the need for diverse approaches to teaching EAE, especially to AAVE speakers. However, testing teaching

approaches will not suffice. We need to know how African American *students* are approaching the task of learning EAE—outside as well as inside the schcol. As Coleman (1997) observes, studies by Bernstein, Heath, and Gilyard "suggest that the home and community play a much larger role in academic literacy acquisition than does schooling" (p. 487). Thus, by focusing on teachers, researchers may overlook successful strategies that students have developed on their own or with others outside the classroom. At the same time, researchers may have underrated some successful teaching strategies that students value more than we suspect. Clearly, we need to ask students about their progress.

METHOD

So I did.

In November 1998, I launched a study to explore how some African American students dramatically improved their control of EAE as they wrote expository essays for Freshman English 002, our introductory composition course at Howard. Through portfolio assessment and a series of discourse-based interviews, I sought answers to the following questions:

- How did the *teachers* strengthen the students' command of EAE?
- What successful strategies did the *students* employ on their own?
- What roles did *other people* and *resources* play in the students' progress?
- What role did the students' and teachers' *language attitudes* play?

Procedure

To carry out the study, each semester, from Fall 1998 to Spring 2000, I asked the teachers of Freshman English 002 to identify African American

students in their classes whose control of EAE had improved dramatically that term. To my surprise, I received the names of only 62 students, all from only 10 teachers, when 002 was taught by at least 20 teachers serving nearly 1,000 students each year. I'm sure the low response rate stems partly from the frenetic pace and pressing demands of the last weeks of classes. However, some teachers confided that, like me, they had few students who had dramatically improved their use of EAE in one semester.

Of the 62 students, 18 did not provide phone numbers, return calls, or show up for the scheduled interview. Of the remaining students, 4 were disqualified because they were not African American or because too many essays were missing from their 002 portfolios. Therefore, the sample for this study consists of only 40 students. Throughout the last two weeks of class and the exam period, my research assistant and I copied and reviewed writing portfolios and conducted 30-minute (taped) interviews with these students and their teachers. During the interviews the students and teachers responded to an attitude scale and answered several open-ended questions. After the interviews, my assistant and I collected relevant handouts, missing papers, and the departmental final exams.

Group Assignment

When I studied the *complete* writing portfolios and the interview transcripts, I experienced Surprise No. 2: Only 18 students met my criteria for the "most improved" students.

Initially, I had planned to identify these students through a pretest-posttest comparison, so I compared the departmental final exam with the departmental diagnostic exam. However, I found that I could not rely on a pretest-posttest comparison for two reasons: (1) several diagnostic essays were irretrievable, and (2) the portfolios revealed patterns of error that did not necessarily show up in the diagnostic or the final.

Therefore, I assessed the entire portfolio of the semester's work (including the departmental exams), looking for *virtual elimination of at least one type of error over the course of the term*. This progress had to be evident in at least the last two papers (including the in-class final). I tracked the errors only in the first *marked* drafts of each essay (normally six drafts per student or a total of 240). I did not track errors in revisions if the teacher had already identified the errors in a previous draft because such revisions told me more about the teacher's skills than the student's.

The errors I counted ranged from minor comma errors to more stigmatizing or confusing errors such as subject-verb agreement and run-on sentences. Since students rarely conquered *all* of their major errors in one term, I classified as "successful" a student who had, for instance, stopped writing fragments but was still struggling with subject-verb agreement. Using this definition, I was shocked to find that only 18 of the 40 referred students qualified as "Successful Students."

The students who did not meet these criteria were classified as "struggling." Lack of effort did not explain their difficulties since, according to

their teachers' interviews and their own, these 22 students were hard workers. Thus, comparing them with the "Successful Students" could reveal what facilitated or hindered progress when students were trying their best.

As this table reveals [Table 1], both groups of students had a similar gender make-up and cultural background. All but one or two students in each group claimed to speak AAVE sometimes. In addition, roughly one third of each group had grown up in predominantly African American neighborhoods, and a little more than two thirds of each group had attended predominantly African American churches. However, relatively few students had attended only predominantly African American schools from elementary through high school. As for the ten teachers who recommended the students, half were black, half, white, and the majority spoke only Standard English.

Data Analysis

To compare the 18 "Successful Students" with the 22 "Struggling Students," I recorded their scores from the attitude scales and computed mean scores for each group. I also coded, counted, and averaged their open-ended responses. Then, when appropriate, I conducted chi square and t-tests for statistical significance.

RESULTS

Before I report the differences between the successful and struggling students, I should briefly describe what was going on in and outside the classroom.

First of all, what were those ten teachers doing? A lot! To help the students avoid their EAE errors, the teachers provided a variety of instructional activities and resources, including essays from our Afrocentric anthology. In the classroom, they set aside time for grammar lessons ("live" and videotaped), grammar tests, oral reading of exercises, peer editing, and correcting errors from class papers. They announced usage survey results and distributed checklists for self-evaluation or proofreading. For homework, they assigned error classification, error analyses, and essay revisions to encourage students to scrutinize their errors; journal entries as preparation for formal writing; sentence patterns (both basic and rhetorical); model sentences from the anthology; Internet searches for grammar aids; and a variety of original and handbook exercises.

Outside the classroom, the teachers conferred with students, usually discussing papers line by line. They offered explicit advice such as "Underline the subject and verb and cross out the intervening prepositional phrase." Finally, in their written comments on students' papers, they identified errors, sometimes citing specific sections of the handbook. They also referred students to the Writing Center for tutorials and/or computer exercises.

While the teachers were clearly doing their best, what were their forty students up to? Well, all of the Successful Students adopted their own strategies for improvement. These strategies included studying rules, organizing their thoughts before writing, reviewing the teacher's comments, spending extra time either studying mistakes in previous essays or proofreading their new essays.

However, there was no strategy that all 18 practiced. The same was true for the Struggling Students, most of whom had also studied their previous mistakes and reread papers before submitting them.

Other people and resources played a role in the progress of both groups. During their interviews, the teachers and students referred to in-class "peer review" or "peer editing" groups that suggested ways students could improve their papers. Some students also acknowledged that—outside class—they had frequently asked roommates, friends, and relatives to proofread their essays. In addition, 5 Successful Students and 4 Struggling Students had visited the Writing Center, which offered both tutorials and grammar/spelling computer programs.

So, given the teaching-learning situation I've just described, what distinguished the Successful Group from the Struggling Group? What do you think?

Well, here's what I found. Both groups attributed most of their progress to their teachers' written comments. However, if you look at the handout, you will see that the significant group differences are *not* directly associated with a particular teacher or teaching strategy.

1. **Problem Identification:** The Successful Students identified their grammatical and spelling problems more accurately than the Struggling Students did [Table 2]. Moreover, the Successful Students usually solved a problem if they had identified it.

2. **Independent Study:** Regardless of the type of strategy, on average, both groups of students considered their independent study skills useful. However, compared to the Struggling Students, significantly more Successful Students attributed their progress to independent study [Table 3].
3. **Motivation:** *None* of the Successful Students identified the teacher as a major source of motivation, while almost a third of the Struggling Students cited their teacher as the motivating force behind their improvement [Table 4].
4. **Collaboration:** While neither group took full advantage of the Writing Center, the Successful Students relied much more on help from friends and family outside the classroom than on peers inside the classroom. However, while both groups found collaborating with others helpful, the average rating for collaboration fell below those for readings, lessons, independent work, writing assignments, and conferences, and they were significantly lower than the ratings for teacher comments [Table 5].
5. **African American and Standard English:** Contrary to what I had expected, the most significant difference between the groups was not related to the lessons, readings, writing assignments, teachers' notations on essays, conferences, peer collaboration, or independent study. Nor did the critical difference stem from differences in motivation, cultural background, or language. No, of all the factors, *language attitudes played the most statistically significant role*. Nearly all of the Successful Students portrayed Standard English, especially EAE, as a "universal" language that allows Americans to understand one another. On the other hand, the Struggling

Students were more likely to regard Standard English merely as a school or job requirement rather than a *lingua franca* to facilitate communication [Table 6]. Notably, the only students who considered Standard English "white" belonged to the Struggling Group.

CONCLUSION

When I shared these findings with our faculty, some were discouraged because they thought that their teaching strategies hadn't made a difference. Please don't jump to such a conclusion. First of all, the results indicate that students who are trying to improve value the specific comments that we write on their essays. Alone, our comments may not guarantee a student's success, but they seem to be necessary, if not sufficient, for students to progress. Second, while there is no one-size-fits-all teaching technique, the results suggest that teachers can do a lot to help African American students master EAE. For instance, we can help by encouraging students to keep track of their most serious errors, to take the initiative to do extra work, to discover their own reasons for trying to write well. Above all, the findings demonstrate the power of students' language attitudes. Long ago research on second-language learning revealed the importance of students' attitudes toward the target language (Gardner & Lambert 1972; Oller et al. 1978; Schumann 1976). This study suggests that we should encourage students to see EAE as a *lingua franca*—a language of wider communication—that does not require giving up AAVE or "acting white."

Given our small sample size and other limitations of the study, these issues demand further investigation. Indeed, with further research, we may find that African American students' acquisition of EAE has more to do with affect than intellect. In the meantime, because of this study, I have started asking my freshman composition students to write a pledge on each paper before they submit it. This pledge states that they have checked the paper for their most troublesome errors, which they must identify from previous papers and name within the pledge. Because of this study, I am also more conscientious about having students enumerate in their portfolios the steps they will take—with and without assistance—to improve their writing. Because of this study, I am trying to expose students to more research, role models, and personal experiences that show them how writing can empower them in the world at large. Finally, because of this study, I will continue to discuss language variety in the classroom, something I've done for years but will now do with greater urgency in the hope that more and more of my students can look back and marvel at how they "got ovah."

Works Cited

Ball, A. (1992). Cultural preference and the expository writing of African American adolescents. Written Communication, 9, 501-32.

_____ (1994). Language learning and linguistic competence of African American children. Linguistics and Education, 7, 23-46.

Baugh, J. (1999). Out of the mouths of slaves: African American language and educational malpractice. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bushey, B.C. (1991). What helps weak writers learn to write better?: A pilot study in the Harvard Expository Writing Program. Diss. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. DAI9132332.

Coleman, C.F. (1997). Our students write with accents: Oral paradigms for ESD students. College Composition & Communication, 48, 486-500.

Delpit, L. (1995). Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom. New York: New Press.

Gardner, R. & Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hairston, M. (1981). Not all errors are created equal: Nonacademic readers in the professions respond to lapses in usage. College English, 43, 794-806.

Labov, W. (1972). Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Oller, J.W., Baca, L.L., & Vigil, A. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest. TESOL Quarterly, 11, 173-183.

Redd, T. (1998). Not all errors are created equal: An update. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Nashville, TN.

_____. (1995). Untapped resources: "Styling" in Black students' writing for Black audiences. In D. Rubin (Ed.), Composing social identity in written language (pp. 221-240). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.

Rickford, J. R. & Rickford, R.J. (2000). Spoken Soul: The Story of Black English. New York: Wiley.

Schumann, J. (1976). Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. Language Learning, 26, 135-143.

Smitherman, G. (1994a). Black talk: Words and phrases from the hood to the amen corner. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

_____. (1994b). "The blacker the berry, the sweeter the juice" : African American student writers. In A.H. Dyson & C. Genishi (Eds.), The need for story: Cultural diversity in classroom and community (pp. 80-101). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

_____. Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America. Detroit: Wayne State UP.

Taylor, H. (1989). Standard English, Black English, and bidailectalism: A controversy. New York: P. Lang.

Torrey, J. (1972). The language of Black children in the early grades. New London: Connecticut College.

Wolfram, W. A. (1991). Dialects and American English. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall & Center for Applied Linguistics.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How did the ***teachers*** strengthen the students' command of EAE?

2. What successful strategies did the ***students*** employ on their own?

3. What roles did ***other people*** and ***resources*** play in the students' progress?

4. What role did the students' and teachers' ***language attitudes*** play?

Table 1

African American Students Selected for the Study

	Successful Students	Struggling Students
Gender	6 Male, 12 Female	8 Male, 14 Female
Nationality	17 U.S., 1 Caribbean	21 U.S., 1 Caribbean
Speech	16 AAVE/EAE, 2 EAE	21 AAVE/EAE, 1 EAE
Black Neighborhood	39%	36%
Black Schools	22%	9%
Black Churches	72%	68%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Students' Perceptions of Their Problems and Progress

	Successful Students	Struggling Students
Mean Rate of Improvement	6.9	7.4
Percentage of Students Who Identified Their Problems	83% (15)	55% (12)

Note. Maximum score = 10.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

The Importance of Independent Work vs. Collaboration

Students Who Attributed Their Progress to . . .	Successful Students *n*	%	Struggling Students *n*	%
Independent Study	18	100%	18	78%
Collaboration	18	72%	22	78%
with Friends or Family	18	61%	21	33%
with In-Class Peer Reviewers	18	6%	21	38%

Table 4

Sources of Motivation

(in descending order of frequency)

Successful Students	**Struggling Students**
Desire for better grades	Desire for better grades
Desire to become a better writer	Teacher's encouragement
Requirement for a major or career	Desire to become a better writer

Note. The Fall 1998 subjects were not asked about their motivation, so this chart excludes responses from 5 members of each group.

Table 5

Mean Ratings for Sources of Improvement

Instructional Activities	Successful Students	Struggling Students
Teachers' Comments	8.9	[redacted]
Conferences	8.8	7.5
Writing Assignments	8.1	7.7
Independent Study	7.6	6.3
Lesson & Class Activities	7.4	6.9
Reading Assignments	6.7	6.5
Collaboration	5.4	[redacted]

Note. Maximum score = 10.

Table 6

Mean Ratings of "Black English" and "Standard English"

Dialect	Successful Students	Struggling Students
"Black English"	5.5	4.8
"Standard English"	7.5	7.8

Table 7

Students Who Called Standard English a Universal Language

Successful Students	Struggling Students
17 (94%)	7 (32%)

"How I Got Ovah":
Success Stories of African American Composition Students, Part II

Conference on College Composition & Communication
Denver, Colorado, March 15, 2001
Teresa M. Redd, Howard University

This study explored how some African American students dramatically improved their control of Edited American English (EAE) in their introductory composition course at Howard University. The participants included 40 students who were enrolled in ENGL 002 in 1998, 1999, or 2000, as well as the 10 teachers who had recommended the students as "most improved." A pretest-posttest comparison and portfolio assessment isolated two distinct groups of students within this sample: 18 "successful" students who had achieved consistent progress and 22 "struggling" students whose performance had proved inconsistent. To determine why the Successful Group had progressed more than the Struggling Group, the research team addressed the following questions:

- How did the *teachers* strengthen the students' command of EAE?
- What successful strategies did the *students* employ on their own?
- What roles did *other people and resources* play in the students' progress?
- What role did the students' and teachers' *language attitudes* play?

With these questions in mind, the team conducted discourse-based interviews with the students and their teachers, classified errors in the portfolios, and coded the interview data. The data analysis revealed that both groups of students attributed most of their progress to their teachers' written comments rather than readings, lessons, writing assignments, conferences, peer review, or independent work. However, there were significant differences in (1) the groups' awareness of their writing problems, (2) their evaluation of their independent study, (3) their sources of motivation, (4) their choice of partners for collaboration, and (5) their attitudes toward Standard English.

Surprisingly, language attitudes played the most statistically significant role in the study: Nearly all of the members of the Successful Group portrayed Standard English, especially EAE, as a "universal" language that allows Americans to understand one another. On the other hand, the Struggling Group was more likely to regard Standard English merely as a school or job requirement rather than a *lingua franca* to facilitate communication. Notably, the only students who considered Standard English "white" belonged to the Struggling Group.

Significant Findings

6. **Teachers' Comments:** Regardless of what their teachers did, both groups of students claimed that the teachers' written comments had helped them the most, especially comments that told them exactly what was wrong and how to improve.

7. **Problem Identification:** The Successful Students identified their grammatical and spelling problems more accurately than the Struggling Students did (t (38) = 2.04, p < .05). Moreover, the Successful Students usually solved a problem if they had identified it.

8. **Independent Study:** Regardless of the type of strategy, on average, both groups of students considered their independent study skills useful. However, compared to the Struggling Students, significantly more Successful Students attributed their progress to independent study (t (17) = 2.20, p < .05).

9. **Motivation:** *None* of the Successful Students identified the teacher as a major source of motivation. On the other hand, almost a third of the Struggling Students cited their teacher as the motivating force behind their improvement.

10. **Collaboration:** While neither group took full advantage of the Writing Center, the Successful Students relied much more on help from friends and family outside the classroom than on peers inside the classroom. On the other hand, the Struggling Students relied almost equally on classmates and "outsiders," and they were just as likely to say that no one other than the teacher had helped them. This contrast between the groups is statistically significant (t(30) = 2.3, p < .05).
    However, while many students found collaborating with others helpful, the average rating for collaboration was modest—only 5.4 for the Successful Students and 6.0 for the Struggling Students.* These ratings fall below those for readings, lessons, independent work, writing assignments, and conferences, and for each group they are significantly lower than the ratings for teachers' comments (t_{suc} (15) = 4.33, p <.01; t_{str} (20) = 3.41, p <.05)

11. **African American English:** Although all but two of the Successful Students spoke African American Vernacular English (AAVE), their average rating of AAVE was only 5.5. Most of these students described AAVE as "the way Black people talk," but two claimed that it did not exist. As for the Struggling Students, most considered AAVE "a tool Black people use to understand one another and to differentiate themselves from other members of society." Yet the Struggling Students gave AAVE an average rating of 4.8 even though, like the Successful Students, virtually all of them spoke AAVE. It is worth noting that while both groups felt that their parents did not particularly like AAVE, the Successful Students believed that their friends liked AAVE (t(26) = 2.45, p < .05).

12. **Standard English:** Like their teachers, both groups of students were slightly more positive about Standard English, and their average ratings were almost identical to their teachers' average of 7.9. Virtually all of the students in each group agreed that it was important to speak and write Standard English on the job or in school and that writing Standard English was as or more important than speaking it. Strikingly, almost all of the Successful Students portrayed Standard English, especially Edited American English (EAE), as a nonracial language of wider communication. These students considered it a "universal" language that allows Americans to understand one another. On the other hand, the Struggling Students were more likely to regard Standard English merely as a school or job requirement rather than a *lingua franca* to facilitate communication (t(32) = 5.41, p <.01). Notably, the only students who characterized Standard English as "white" belonged to the Struggling Group.

*on a scale of 1-10, where 10 is the highest rating